PA-L A

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg -King assassination records, 12/8/78
Privacy Act records, both appealed

As the FBI perfects its building-in of obfuscation and confusion, a process I have been privileged to observe over a period of time, it manages to create needless problems and to say what it perhaps does not intend.

Enclosed are copies of two letters, with attachments, that I received from Jim Lesar in today's mail. Both were sent to him by the FBI's FOIA/PA chief. Mr. McCreight did not send me either an original letter, a copy of the attachments.

Each letter begins with the statement that it "is in response to the administrative appeal of your client, Harold Weisberg, from the denial..." in one case of Baltimore, the other of Los Angeles.

It happens that I do not have a case in court on the denials from my Privacy Act request and that I have not asked Mr. Lesar to represent me at the administrative level. Therefore, assuming that despite our many disagreements Mr. McCreight is not an untruthful FBI executive, I also assume that he refers to a case in court. Of my present cases in district court Mr. McCreight can be referring only to one, C.A. 75-1996. Both sets of attachments relate to a kind of surveillance on me and there is such an Item in the request involved in C.A.75-1996. Albeit with no prior compliance.

In this I make a new appeal of the now ancient appeals I, not Mr. Lesar, filed. I appeal the denial by withholding without any claim to any exemption in the covering letters or on the attachments and the absence of any calim to exemption noted on the documents themselves.

As I have had occasion to remind you a number of times recently in 1976 the judge directed that no FBI names be withheld. This was done in both matters.

The now provided records of both offices are of a monitoring of expression and belief that is a form of surveillance and to the best of my knowledge ~~with~~ to without sanction. I know of no basis for the FBI to have engaged in this kind of activity, no legitimate authorization of the spending of public moneys in these ways.

In each case the file is a 100 file or so-called "internal security." (While I presume it is not new to you it now turns out that with regard to its own internal security and that of its records the FBI has been throwing stones from inside a glass house.) I regard including me in any kind of a "security" files a deliberate defamation and I again ask for any and all relevant records. I have not, in any proceeding, case, form or manner been provided with any basis for so classifying any record about or relating to me. As I review my own life and my affiliations and lack of them, my acts and beliefs I recall nothing that can justify any official right to classify me as an "internal" or "national ~~secuiry~~ security" object or risk. Now I cannot say this for those who violate laws, like the Freedom of Information Act; those

Those who violate the Constitution, as in denying citizens the enjoyment of privacy and the security of their homes and property or intrude into legal rights, as of privacy in consultation with counsel; those who engage in official breakings and enterings and burglaries; those who without authorization intercept communications; those who destroy records involved in criminal and civil cases in court; or those who swear falsely in courts of law.

The xerox of my letter to the editor of the local paper, which on any subject is none of the FBI's business, was originally classified for filing as 100-27607 on 12/28/70. (This date coincides in time with my filing several FOIA suits against the FBI. Is this what makes me a risk?) This then was stricken through and 190-18-5 replaced it. I cannot be certain but I do not recall receiving any records from any 190 file before now. Therefore, other records remain withheld.

There is another entry, obliterated, under date of 4/21/71. This is immediately after publication of my book on the King assassination, Frame-Up, which is critical of the FBI's record in that case. With what appears to be the same implement and in the same hand the 100 file designation was restored.

While I doubt that the subject matter of my letter interests you, because it does relate to the firing of a college professor who had been critical of the FBI at another college, if we are to observe consistent policies and standards when may I expect the firing of the Attorney General, the FBI Director and an assortment of other public officials, including elected representatives and judges? These are among those who have found the courage, long after me, to criticize the FBI.

No record is provided explaining either the clipping of this letter, the justification for it or its forwarding from the Frederick Residency to the Baltimore Field Office.

Please note also that with my name underscored there is the direction "Index." This means that the prior assurances of the Baltimore Field Office of having searched its indices were false assurances. (Glass house again.) May I now ask that you obtain a copy of any and all index entries relating to me and give me your assurances that my appeals has been processed properly? When the FBI lies I think you have no other choice if appeal is to be meaningful and once you learn of the lying.

With regard to 157-4616-124 I know of nothing to justify the FBI belief it reflects as expurgated - that I am so decrepit I cannot recall the name of the SA to whom I learned those record. I recall this and his embarrassment when he returned then in the company of another agent - and read to me what he had been directed to read to me from a yellow legal pad. (Still withheld, please provide.) I know only to well that I have failed but I really do not know of anything in my recent dealing with the FBI to entice or persuade them to believe I have so few marbles left. (Aside from this there is the continuing question of the withholding of FBI names.)

It is Ronald A. Lichtinger. I intend no offense in referring to him as a neighbor, albeit one who appears since then to have opted placing more distance between our residences. And I hasten to assure you that while the owners of the local Red Horse may disagree with me I do not regard his involvement with a son or sons in a Halloween prank in which the life-sized symbol of a red horse was implicated as any real threat to internal security. Even FBI boys will indeed be boys, regardless of actual age.

In the absence of claim to exemption for the obliteration of his name, going on a long and contemptuous past I believe the unmade claim is to protect his privacy. Now do you suppose this is because his name, address and phone number appear on page 106 of the current local phone book?

What is not obliterated on the stamp at the bottom notes indexing and serialization. (I would appreciate restoration of the excision that is made without claim to exemption and thus outside the exemptions of the Act.) But when I see I am now serialized under "bombing matters" and "racial matters" in addition to "internal security" and I recall that I have also been listed under "loyalty,""treason" and "espionage," I find it difficult to believe that the same FBI, in a record a copy of which I have provided you from the eviscerated Long tickler, that stated quite unequivocally that I have never been involved in any criminal activity. (That, I remind you, was only because in that record I was classified under "bank robbery.")

Objectionable as I find this police-statism I also take some reassurance from it - that despite my age and health the FBI has fallen apart more than I have.

An unclear note at the bottom of the first page seems to be "Post." This, if the case, in addition to indexing I think requires no further explanation and does require the record it reflects being provided.

Now if you read this record you may find an explanation for what I recall as having been embarrassing to the hero of the Red Horse adventure, having to read me a letter that the FBI would not send me. Not a full explanation, understand. But enough. If I cite only the last of the itemization of the "Minutemen" materials I loaned the FBI, the part on the second page of listing,"...training documents...and other bulletins containing detailed instructions on the manufacture of booby traps and other explosivex devices and silencers and weapons" it may appear that I am something other than anti-police or anti-law-and-order, even FBI style. (A full explanation might lead to the belief that through an informer named something like Gmathwohl the FBI had its part of responsibility for the Greenwich Village explosion in which several "Weatherpeople" lost their lives.)

The next page is incomplete. I would appreciate those pages that preceed it. I would also appreciate copies of any and all records I have already requested that

in the FBI's concept of legality and propriety had me under "security investigation," even if it is "the fact that there is not sufficient information to merit further investigation under current criteria for security investigations." (Somebody was pretty brave in that FBI, I think.)

There is the recommendation "that this case be closed administratively." May I please have the record of this. You know, what is in that index that was searched, so the FBI said.

I think I can understand why subscribing to the National Guardian is not held against me. If it were consistent then the FBI would be redder than red from its subscriptions to the Daily Worker and its subsidizing of the Communist Party with tax funds. (The next "anonymous mailing" of photographs of the subscription list would not have disclosed that I was a subscriber because I would not subscribe after radicals took that publication over.)

I'm grateful for being reminded of that hasty letter, improper as this kind of surveillance and domestic intelligence operation and compilation is. It seems that I was not alone in expressing those views. Not long thereafter there was a meaningful change in the administration at Reed college and it flourished and expanded enormously while other colleges were going broke. I do not suggest that my letter had anything to do with this. But I do suggest that there is real danger in any official, especially those with police concepts, passing judgements on the beliefs of Americans - particularly when those who pass these judgements reflect beliefs that were outdated at Salem.

All of this should remind you of the rest of those withheld records. Of course I would appreciate them but there is no indication that they will be provided at all soon. Until that happy day would you be kind enough to provide me with the records reflecting that this appeal is being processed as countless affidavit state is practice, in sequence of receipt? My belief is that the appeal is well over two years old.

Because I cannot provide the transcript of former Sn William Lawrence's testimony before the House assassins committee I enclose a marked copy of a story from the Washington Star of 11/22/78 that has just reached me. I have marked what appears to be a continuous part of the story in two different part to be fair to the FBI because Lawrence is quoted as having knowledge of FBI investigations I do not recall being reflected in the Memphis Field Office records I have received. If his testimony is truthful then I of course appeal withholdings. I have separate the first part of what I have marked because from the records I did receive I cannot vouch for what he is quoted as testifying to having seen. Asked if the FBI "was too racially biased" he replied, "I categorically deny that."

Lawrence and his sidekick Howe generated countless thousands of pages of domestic intelligence records. Of these I have and have read several thousand. In them I found adult blacks being referred to as "boys," "good" and "bad," naturally; and as "monkey faced."

When an adult black woman who was not married became pregnant that, also naturally, became a subject of Lawrence/Howe/FBI interest and is reported on extensively, as were her prior associations. And her relations for several generations, with federal employment duly noted. I don't recall how old the child was in the last such record I read but it had been born, reported in Memphis records. (Does one wonder about the crime rate?)

My own view is that if his own career is not to Lawrence "racially biased" when this is but a glimpse of it then his word cannot be taken without confirmation with regard to existing records I do not recall receiving.

If the FBI had complied with my request for the indices or if you had had the FBI comply on appeal I might have been able to be more helpful in the foregoing.

Often it is not difficult to be fairly confident of the withheld identifications. My hunch is that the withheld identification on the incomplete Baltimore record is of Rose, husband Ward, wife Canadian citizen named Belva. (She never would become an American citizen, reportedly because of her attitude toward the United States. What better credentials for an FBI source? Unless it be those others referred to, figuratively and literally "lurers.) I suspect that another withholding from the Los Angeles records on which you have not acted may be Charach - and I can as easily guess his source for that particular mendacity that the FBI promptly provided to the Secret Service, of which all that was represented in that record was false.

When the FBI cannot read its own indices faithfully - and do I have to tell you the importance to the FBI of those cards? - can we ever expect compliance?

Each time something come out of the murk of those secret records it discloses remaining records not provided - and the FBI's knowledge of it from the searching and from the processing.

If you check the libels sought so diligently from those who did not welcome the presence of the single Jew in the Nyattatown area I believe you will find the origin of the foulest of those many libels, that my wife and I celebrated the Russian revolution every year. You will also find that this was sent to the White House and both houses of Congress but that no effort was ever made to learn that it was false. Obviously. Then it could not have been used, could it? So I do not expect you to find any record of any effort made to confirm what the FBI knew could not be true when it defamed us with it in more ways than I have told you.